

### REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48 were presented for examination. In an Office Action of May 19, 2004, claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48 were rejected. Claims 1, 15, 17, 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, and 46 are herein amended. Claims 49, 50, and 51 are herein added. The amended and newly added claims add no new matter. Applicants now request reconsideration in light of the below remarks and allowance of claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-51.

In paragraph 4, of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48 under U.S.C. § 112(2) as being indefinite due to omission of essential steps. Specifically, Examiner states that the omitted steps are: how to detect a missing tag read before compensating; and how to compensate for a mistake. In relevant part, independent method claims 1 and 17, and independent program storage device claims 45 and 46, as amended, recite "compensating for missing information by using a previous tag read and a current tag read." Additionally, independent system claims 33, 36, 39 and 42, as amended, recite "compensation logic compensates for missing information by using a previous tag read and a current tag read." Accordingly, various embodiments of missing information can indicate a missing tag read; and various uses of previous and current tag reads can compensate for that missing information. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the indefiniteness rejection with respect to the independent and related dependent claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48.

In paragraph 5, Examiner rejects claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Information Visibility and Its Effect on Supply Chain Dynamics* (Information Visibility) authored by Yogesh V. Joshi without consideration for the formerly indefinite limitation set forth above. As discussed in an Amendment A and Response of March 5, 2004, during an interview on March 1, 2004, Examiner and Applicants' Attorney reached agreement that the subject matter of claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48 with the formerly indefinite limitation was patentable over the prior art of record. Given that this limitation is no longer indefinite, Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-48.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13, 15-29 and 31-51, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,  
XI LI, *ET AL.*

Date: August 19, 2004

By: 

Dorian Cartwright, Reg. No. 53,8583  
Authorized Attorney (37 CFR § 1.34(a))  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7247  
Fax: (650) 938-5200